

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

The Examiner's Restriction Requirement finding that applicant has claimed "more than one species of the generic invention" which species are deemed to lack "unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1" is respectfully traversed.

The species identified by the Examiner (Figure 2, Figure 6 and claim 32) are believed to be appropriately "linked" to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1--at least as above amended so as to make claim 32 now depend from claim 30.

Species 1 (Figure 2) concerns a system for the control of access between two sides of a network, where the proxy server (21) is located behind the outer firewall of the remote side (3). The method is set out in Figures 4 and 5. As shown in Figure 2, the proxy controller (21) is located in the remote site (3), to which a control station (11) sends messages.

Species 2 (Figure 6) is described on page 11, lines 19 onwards. It is directed to the same problem as that addressed by "Species 1" viz. to control access to devices behind a firewall in a secured network, by using the same technique of Species 1. This is confirmed by reference to the identical steps depicted in the signal flows of Figures 3 and 7 which refer respectively to Species 1 and Species 2. This Figure 6 aspect of the invention further includes an "overlay" which provides an additional monitoring function, so that the system of Figure 6 also allows for the monitoring of events at the remote site. The event monitoring function is depicted in the flow chart of Figure 8.

Put another way:

(the system of Figure 6) = (system of Figure 1) + (monitoring function of Figure 8).

As stated on page 12, line 32 to page 13, line 2, this could be equally described as:

(the system of Figure 6) = (system of Figure 2) + (monitoring function of Figure 8).

Since the remote monitoring method of Species 2 uses the remote controlling method of Species 1, these inventions are believed to be suitably “linked” to a single general inventive concept.

As for Species 3, this is really just a more specific description of the invention already generally described at claim 30. This fact is made more explicit now by making claim 32 depend from claim 30. Accordingly, claim 32 is now also properly “linked” under PCT Rule 13.1.

As required by the outstanding action, in order to ensure being fully responsive, if the Restriction Requirement is not withdrawn as above requested, applicant hereby elects for further prosecution Species 1 on which at least claims 1-18 are readable.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: /Larry S. Nixon/
Larry S. Nixon
Reg. No. 25,640

LSN:tlm
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100